

Amendments to the Drawings

Submitted herewith are 9 replacement sheets that provide better quality drawings.

Sheet 1 includes Figure 1A. Applicants have added reference number 118 to Component Content in Figure 1A (e.g., Specification, paragraph 25). Applicants have also amended Figure 1A amended to show reference numbers 126 for the User/Developer blocks (e.g., Specification, paragraph 22).

Sheet 2 includes Figure 1B. Applicants have added reference number 132 to Component Registry in Figure 1B (e.g., Specification, paragraph 37).

Sheet 7 includes Figure 4. Applicants have amended Figure 4 to show reference number 414 (e.g., Specification, paragraph 50).

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-26 are pending.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 18, 22, and 26 and cancelled non-method claims 1-17 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-26 prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 18, 22, and 26 were amended and claims 1-17 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-26 as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Nguyen for holding a telephone interview with their representative on April 29, 2008 at 2:30 pm (EST). During the telephone interview, proposed claim amendments to claim 18 were discussed. Examiner Nguyen suggested further amendments. Applicants' representative agreed to consider further amendments. No other agreement was reached.

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during telephone interview dated April 29, 2008. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the telephone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

The drawings are objected to because they do not include reference signs 118, 202, 132, 414 mentioned in the description. Applicants have added reference number 118 to Component Content in Figure 1A (e.g., Specification, paragraph 25). Applicants have removed reference number 202 from the Specification. Applicants have added reference number 132 to Component Registry in Figure 1B (e.g., Specification, paragraph 37). Replacement Sheet 7 with Figure 4 shows reference number 414 (e.g., Specification, paragraph 50).

Also, Figures 1A and 4 are objected to as missing portions. Applicants are submitting Replacement Sheet 1 with Figure 1A amended to show reference numbers 126 for the

User/Developer blocks (e.g., Specification, paragraph 22). Applicants are submitting Replacement Sheet 7 with Figure 4 amended to show reference number 414 (e.g., Specification, paragraph 50). Applicants believe that this provides the portions the Examiner submits are not shown. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse. In addition, Applicants have cancelled claims 1-17, and the rejection is moot.

Claims 1-8, 11-13, and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al (U.S. 6,256,712) in view of Deitz et al (U.S. 6,928,328). Applicants respectfully traverse, however, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1, 22, and 26. Claims 1-8, 11-13, and 15 have been cancelled, and the rejection is moot as to these cancelled claims.

Amended claim 18 describes associating a content approval workflow process with the web site component; detecting an update of the web site component, in response to detecting the update, executing the content approval workflow process to assess whether the updated web site component is approved, and deploying the updated web site component while maintaining referential integrity of the website by: accessing metadata concerning the updated web site component to determine whether the updated web site component has been approved for deployment and adding related web site components that have not been selected for deployment to a deployment transaction including the updated website component to enable the related components that depend on the updated component to be properly deployed (e.g., Specification, paragraphs 7-8).

Amended claim 26 describes detecting an update of a web site component, the web site component being one of a plurality of web site components defining structure and content of a web site, wherein the plurality of web site components are stored in a multilevel hierarchical structure; in response to detecting the update, reviewing a plurality of relationships to determine components that depend on the updated component; and executing a dependent update workflow process to execute at least one operation on at least one of the determined dependent

components, wherein the at least one executed operation relates to updating the at least one determined dependent component.

Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18.

Moreover, amended claim 22 describes detecting an update of a web site component includes detecting a deletion of a component, wherein attempts to delete the web site component are prevented when other components are dependent on the web site component (e.g., Specification, paragraph 39).

The Challenger patent describes a trigger monitor monitoring object sources (Col. 30, lines 51-53). The Challenger patent also describes that, when an object source detects a change, a trigger is invoked, and the trigger is typically used to cause actions to occur automatically in response to modification of the data (Col. 29, lines 40-44).

The Deitz patent describes a software object authorization system that includes the ability to select signers who must approve a software object before it is downloaded to a process control system (Abstract).

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Challenger patent nor the Deitz patent, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the subject matter of amended claims 18-26.

Claims 9-10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger – Deitz in view of Chkodrov et al (U.S. 7,107, 340). Applicants respectfully traverse. In addition, claims 9-10 and 14 have been cancelled, and the rejection is moot.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: April 30, 2008

By:____/Janaki K. Davda/_____

Janaki K. Davda
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7973
Fax: 310-556-7984